



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On Mill's Statement of the Origin of the Elzevir Greek Text of 1624.

BY ISAAC H. HALL.

IN Mill's great Greek New Testament (Oxford, 1707), on page CXXXVII of the Prolegomena, occurs the description of the Elzevir Greek Testament of 1624, whose errors have been repeated and magnified by successive writers quite down to our own times. Speaking of that New Testament of 1624, Mill says: "Verum in Editione biennio post ad hujus amussim adornata, *Beza* notat Editioni Elzevirianæ præfuisse viros haud paucos eruditione & pietate præstantes. Elegans plane est hæc Editio, & admodum emendata. Textus ipse, quicquid ferant Curatores isti, ad unum Stephanicum tertium totus compositus videtur, præterquam duodecim in locis, in quibus solis, quantum video, à Stephanico recessere."

Concerning the second error above, that the Elzevir text was conformed to the third of Stephen (1550), except in the twelve places where Mill detected variations, we need spend no time. The first error, namely, that in an edition two years after the Elzevir of 1624 *Beza remarks* that not a few men eminent for erudition and piety superintended the work, has puzzled many a scholar, but nevertheless has been faithfully handed down through a long chain of editors and writers, often with ridiculous modifications. Compare, for instance, the foot-note on pages 36-39, vol. i, of the Boston edition (1810) of Macknight's *Apostolical Epistles*, where mention is made of an Elzevir New Testament of "1622," and another "two years after this . . . corrected, as Beza informs us, by not a few persons eminent for learning and piety." Macknight evidently did not know that Beza died in 1605; he misreads Mill, as if the latter were speaking of an Elzevir issued two years after that of 1624; and then corrects Mill's 1624 to 1622. Of course no Elzevir of 1622 (nor any Elzevir "two years after" that 1624) ever existed; and Macknight's statement is all blunder and confusion. Mill was speaking of a Beza edition of 1626, and says "Beza" instead of saying "Beza's Testa-

ment," or some more accurate phrase. As it stands, Mill's statement is, of course, an error.

Respecting the statement made by Mill I have recently obtained some light, which is the object of this note.

As just remarked, Beza died in 1605; and he could not have made the remark apparently attributed to him by Mill. But it seems impossible that Mill, who shows himself so thoroughly informed about Beza in other respects, did not know that he died long before "two years after" 1624.

A guess in Gregory and Abbot's *Prolegomena*, p. 217, note 1, almost hits the truth. After quoting and remarking upon a portion of Mill's language given above, the note proceeds: "Fortasse editione Amstelodamensi a. 1626 utebatur, cui addita est versio Bezae Latina." I had some correspondence with Dr. Abbot about that New Testament of 1626, and know that he never saw a copy of it, but derived his knowledge from the bibliographies. Our correspondence had reference to the name of its publisher, and took place at a time when the part of the *Prolegomena* now issued must have been printed, but of course before publication, for the title shows that the beloved man had then departed. While our correspondence on that subject was still going on, I obtained a copy of that New Testament, and was enabled to explain to Dr. Abbot how it was that Reuss had called it "Laurii I." (in the "Index Editionum" of his *Bibliotheca N. T. Gr.*) instead of "Laurentii I.," since the other bibliographies, especially the Dutch one of Isaac Le Long, would have given him the correct name: in Latin, Henricus Laurentius, in Dutch, Hendrik Laurens or Laurensz. The book has an engraved title page; with the legend in a rather confined space in the middle, as follows: "D.N. | IESV CHRISTI | Testamentum | novum Gr. Lat. | Theodoro Beza interpr. | Prioribus editionibus | multo accuratius et | a multis mendis | expurgatum. | Amsterodami | Sumptibus | Henrici Laur. | 1626." The lines have all to be short, for the reason just stated; and the last three lines, which comprise the imprint, are contained in an oval whose longest diameter is filled by the "Henrici Laur.," the space being not long enough to admit the whole "Laurentii" without abbreviation. And hence the mistake of Reuss. It is also to be noted that while the place of publication is given as "Amsterodami," the colophon gives "Lugduni Batavorum" as the place of printing. The text is a reprint of the Elzevir of 1624.

Had Dr. Abbot seen a copy of the book, he would at once have understood the origin of Mill's language. The only prefatory matter

is about four pages of "Typographus Lectori." It is on the second page of this address of the printer to the reader that the mystery is solved, in the following passage: "*Vt autem scias quid hic editione præstitum sit, paucis sic habe. In textu Græco secuti sumus cum, qui anno cIdo Id xxiv. Lugduni prodijt, cui non pauci viri, eruditione & pictatē præstantes præfuere, qui ad regium exemplar & optimas quasque editiones eum cum cura expresserunt.*" etc. Here is the language which Mill borrows, quoting with a trifling transposition and change, as required by the structure of his sentence: "Editioni Elzevirianæ præfuisse viros haud paucos eruditione & pietate præstantes." It is plain that Mill intended to give this Testament of Laurens as his authority for the statement that not a few men eminent for learning and piety superintended the construction of the text of the Elzevir of 1624; and, indeed, since these words seem to be all the direct information we have respecting the origin of that text, we must admit that Mill cited the best and nearest authority he could.

Just here we may remark that if any one should presume to guess that the "Lugduni" of Laurens' printer, above, might not be "Lugduni Batavorum" (i.e. Lyons, not Leyden), the contrary is certain from the familiar usage in Holland, as well as from the words "*qui ad regium exemplar*" etc., which can be nothing else than an adaptation of the language on the title page of the (Leyden, "Lugduni Batavorum") Elzevir of 1624: "*Ex Regijs alijsque optimis editionibus cum cura expressum.*" This matter will be clearer on comparing Mill's language preceding that first above quoted, where he supplies the "Batavorum" and presents other coincidences with the words of Laurens. Besides which, it will be difficult to find any other Greek New Testament at all of 1624.

Reading on a little farther in the printer's address to the reader in Laurens' Greek Testament, we discover the immediate source of the Latin text of the Beza which it contained: "*Huic [sc. textui Græco] ex adverso Theodori Bezae interpretationem adjunximus, qua, ut præclarè ac optimè de Republica Christiana meritis est, ita cæteris palmam præripuisse videtur. Est autem hæc edita anno cIdo Id lxxiii, eique, pro ut ex præfatione videre est, præfuit vir doctissimus Loevelerius Villerius.*"

If the date 1573 is correct (and it is repeated in the reprint of this address to the reader in the second edition of Laurens, 1647), Beza was still alive at the time this printer says that Villerius (i.e. L'Oyseleur seigneur de Villers) edited Beza's text. But, for that matter, the address of Villerius to Henry Count Huntingdon (which is prob-

ably meant in the word "præfatione") occurs in the minor editions of Beza's Greek-Latin Testament, from 1580 onwards, as well as in later books. What Villerius did was first to turn certain notes of Beza into French, at Beza's suggestion (for French editions, etc.); then to add certain notes of Beza's major editions, with these French notes turned back into Latin, and some notes of Villerius himself, to the later editions of Beza's Testaments — both those published during the latter part of his life, as those of 1590, 1604, and those issued after his death, as the three editions of 1611, published respectively by Joh. Vignon, Jac. Stoer, and Sam. Crispin.

Whether the words above cited, which state the source of the Latin text of Beza followed by Laurens, escaped Mill or not, he must have known that he was not citing the personal authority of Beza, but that of the printer of Laurens. Mill's form of speech may be accounted for by supposing a slip of the pen, which maintained its place in print; but the more probable supposition is that he used a common form of speech, current long before his day as well as long after, which in form attributed to Beza every Greek-Latin edition which contained his text. My copy of the second edition of Laurens, 1647, is in the original vellum binding, with the contemporary lettering on the back: "T. BEZA | Novum Testament. | Gr: Lat:.". The title and general appearance of the minor Bezas of 1590, 1604, and their successors of 1611, so closely resemble one another that it needs a sharp look to see the difference. Other successors with similar matter but of smaller size (and they are not a few) passed under the name of Beza's Testaments. The edition of Laurens is the parent of a series of different form; and all of them both are and have been called Beza's testaments. — Even Reuss, whom no one can accuse of ignorance of the facts, styles the 1611 editions of Vignon, Crispin, and Stoer, "Bezae minor V." Such a conventional misnomer was not misleading, any more than the titles of Beza's Latin Testaments, as they are published to-day. The title itself of the "Bezae minor V," and still more its address of the printer to the reader, show that other hands than Beza's were engaged in constructing the work (though after a manner indicated and authorized by Beza); and yet the address of the printer refers to the "*binæ editiones superiores*" as containing some work done by Loselerius Villerius (as, indeed, those editions themselves show), while it also says that "*ambo Theodoro Bezae debentur*". The "*binæ editiones superiores*," were the minor Bezas of 1590 and 1604.

Of course this mode of speaking is liable to mislead where it is not

understood, and Mill's use of it (supposing him to have actually so used it) is of a kind that requires the largest latitude of interpretation in order to justify it as correct in any ears outside of a limited circle. But in view of all the facts, it seems that some such explanation compasses the truth. The case is quite different from mistaking the Greek text of the pseudo-Bezae of 1559 for Beza's own work. But whether Mill's statement is a slip, a misapprehension, or a free expression intended to convey the correct idea, it is plain where he went for his authority.

I may add that Wetstein, in his criticisms of Mill's statement, is quite astray. See the Prolegomena, p. 152, in vol. i of his Greek Testament. His words are: "Quod enim Millius . . . 'in editione', inquit, 'biennio post ad hujus amussim adornata, *Beza* notat, editioni Elzevirianæ præfuisse viros haud paucos eruditione & pietate præstantes,' non uno laborat vitio. Nam editio secunda non *biennio*, sed integro novennio post primam adornata A°. 1633.; neque Præfatio a Beza, qui jam A°. 1605. diem obierat, scribi potuit: denique in hac Præfatione sermo non est de iis, qui primæ editioni, sed qui secundæ præfuerunt, & non de iis, qui Textum editionis primæ concinnarunt, sed de iis, qui Textum editionis secundæ a mendis typothetarum purgarunt, & ad primam cognoverunt." Wetstein goes on to say that he had inquired of the learned men in Holland (Belgio), but in vain; he could get nothing but conjectures in reply. Then he proceeds to give his own conjectures. But, of course, Wetstein assumes that Mill meant the Elzevir of 1633, to which his language cannot apply.

Scrivener (*Plain Introd.*, last ed., p. 442), also, plainly makes a mistake in saying that the Elzevir editor of 1633 refers to the edition of 1624 as that "omnibus acceptam." The Elzevir editor or editors of 1633 (they are called "Typographi", in the plural, in the title to the preface, and they write in the plural), after speaking of the former edition, say: "Exemplaribus distractis ac divenditis, editionem, omnibus acceptam, denuo doctorum oculis subjecimus." That is, since the copies of the old edition are disposed of, they have now submitted to the eyes of the learned an edition "omnibus acceptam", which, of course, is that of 1633 — as all the other writers understand it.

In the midst of all the writers or editors, perhaps Tischendorf stands alone as sticking to the text of the unquestioned authority on the Elzevir editors. He styles them simply "Elzeviri typographi Leydenses" (*N. T.*, ed. vii, *Prolegg.*, p. LXXXIV), apparently taking the

“typographi” from the title to the preface of their edition of 1633, and considering them the responsible men, no matter who their agents might be. But the mistakes of critics like Wetstein, especially after such diligence to set himself right, are to be looked upon with the greatest allowance, even if made in criticizing so great and so noble a worker for truth as Mill. In contrast with *all* these men were the performances of perhaps a majority of editors and publishers of the Greek Testament during the latter half of the seventeenth century. Their shameless frauds, coupled with the sad fact of the implicit faith with which they were generally received by the clergy, form the darkest kind of a background to the labors of such men as Walton, Curcellaeus, and Fell. What would to-day be thought of the edition of Arnold Leers of Rotterdam, 1654, who shamelessly copied the title and preface of the Elzevir edition of 1633, changing only the heading of the preface by altering “Typographi”, plural, to “Typographus”, singular? Whether he hoped to deceive by retaining the allusion to the Elzevir of 1624 in the title and preface, or whether he knew no better, does not appear. The book is a pretty close copy of the style of the Elzevir of 1633, but is said by Reuss to be a reprint of the third Elzevir, of 1656. It does, indeed, accord with the latter in sundry places where the two vary, but it sides with the former against the latter in the error in Romans vii, 2, which omits τοῦ νόμου. But enough.